

# **CANADIAN CENTRE FOR DRUG-FREE SPORT**

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION BY DR. KAREN WILKINSON  
FOR CATEGORY II REINSTATEMENT PURSUANT TO THE  
DOPING CONTROL STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES

## **DECISION**

**ED RATUSHNY, Q.C.**

**ADJUDICATOR**

HEARINGS HELD IN OTTAWA ON AUGUST 18th AND 23rd, 1995

## D E C I S I O N

As a result of testing positive for a banned substance on July 7th, 1995, Dr. Karen Wilkinson was suspended from competition for four years. This adjudication process was established to hear and decide her application for reinstatement. A decision was rendered on August 24, 1995, that the applicant had failed to satisfy the onus of establishing circumstances which would justify her reinstatement. The following are the related written reasons.

Dr. Wilkinson is a Canadian athlete who has competed nationally and internationally for Athletics Canada as a javelin thrower. She grew up in Victoria, British Columbia and attended U.S. universities on track scholarships. She moved to Hillsborough, North Carolina, in September of 1994 with Mr. Carl Brantley with whom she lived. They were married on February 1, 1995. Dr. Wilkinson had qualified as a doctor of chiropractic, established a practice in Hillsborough and continued to train for the javelin throw. In 1995, she competed in the Pan American Games in Argentina in March, the Harry Jerome Classic in Vancouver in May and the Canadian Championships in Montreal in July.

After competing in the Harry Jerome Classic, Dr. Wilkinson and Mr. Brantley had a formal wedding ceremony together with her family and friends on June 1st in British Columbia. They then returned to their residence in North Carolina. Mr. Brantley was suspicious that Dr. Wilkinson was having an affair with a member of the U.S. shotput team whom she had met in Argentina. On June 7th, shortly after returning from British Columbia they had an argument which led to a physical fight. Mr. Brantley moved out of their home and Dr. Wilkinson later obtained a court restraining order against him.

Carl Brantley is a professional wrestler under the name of Vladimir Koloff. There is no dispute that he is an emotionally volatile person who is prone to erratic behaviour. He was a possessive, controlling and jealous husband. Both prior and subsequent to their separation on June 7th, Mr. Brantley made threats both personally and by telephone to his wife, other athletes, her friends, clients and others. His threats included killing himself and

others. In the two weeks following the separation, he called Dr. Wilkinson at both her home and her office as often as four times per hour throughout the day. A letter was filed from his family doctor indicating that he was undergoing treatment for "psychiatric problems".

On June 9th, Mr. Brantley started a series of telephone calls to Mr. Hugh Wilson, who is the Manager of Development Programmes for Athletics Canada. The gist of these calls was the allegation that Dr. Wilkinson was a user of anabolic steroids. He claimed that when she was tested at the Harry Jerome Classic, she had avoided detection by providing a "clean" sample of urine which had been produced by another person. He later sent to Mr. Wilson a device made from a turkey baster and a tube which he claimed was hidden in her track suit when she was tested. He claimed that she was able to manipulate the device to release the false sample of urine when it appeared that she was providing her own. He alleged that she had been using steroids for one and one-half years of their two year relationship.

No useful purpose would be served in attempting to document with precision the various telephone calls made by Mr. Brantley to Mr. Wilson (and others) following the June 7th fight and separation. Mr. Brantley was vague and oblique before specifically accusing his wife. Later, he indicated that he would be recanting his story because of pressure from Dr. Wilkinson and her mother and fear of retribution through criminal charges or reporting him to the Internal Revenue Service. However, the gist of his original allegations do "hold together". In other words, she tested negative at the Harry Jerome Classic because of the device (which was provided), she had falsified her qualifying standard for the Pan American games (confirmed by her coach) and he stated that she would test positive if tested at the Canadian Nationals in mid-July. (The test was done a week earlier but proved to be positive). In other words, any contradictions, amongst the allegations made by Mr. Brantley in June, are more consistent with his unstable emotional state than with lying.

As a consequence of these allegations, the Canadian Centre for Drug-Free Sport

requested the assistance of the U.S. Olympic Committee in conducting "short-notice testing" on Dr. Wilkinson. In addition, the CCDS made the following request:

... please ensure that the athlete provides a witnessed urine sample wearing a short-sleeve shirt. It is our understanding that she may be manipulating the process by substituting urine from a stored reservoir (i.e. bag with tubing).

Dr. Wilkinson was tested in her office on July 7th. By letter dated July 16, 1995, the President of Athletics Canada advised her that her sample had been analyzed and found to contain metabolites of the banned substance nandralone. In other words, she had tested positive. As a result, she was immediately suspended. The letter was read to her over the telephone and sent to her by courier.

Dr. Wilkinson does not dispute that the positive test of her urine was valid. However, she denies any personal knowledge as to how the banned substance entered her body. Her "defence" is that her estranged husband had secretly put the drug in her soft drink and she unknowingly drank it. She relies entirely on Mr. Brantley to explain the circumstances of how the drug was administered to her.

By letter dated July 27, Dr. Wilkinson applied for Category II Reinstatement under the Doping Control Standard Operating Procedures of the Canadian Centre for Drug-Free Sport. The established Procedures place the onus on the applicant of proving, on a balance of probabilities, exceptional circumstances justifying reinstatement. Applications for reinstatement often involve acknowledgement of a transgression by the athlete. In those cases, the "exceptional circumstances" may take the form of otherwise exemplary character, co-operation with authorities, good prospects for rehabilitation, true remorse, personal contribution to the sport and other mitigating factors which are specified as criteria in the Procedures.

Dr. Wilkinson's application falls within a different category. She simply denies any wrongdoing. The circumstances are such that she is either the victim of sabotage or she is not telling the truth. If she has been the victim of sabotage, then she should be reinstated without any need to consider any of the other factors. In that respect, her circumstances would be analogous to those in the Jim Dan Corbett Adjudication (Adjudicator Borowicz, Feb. 8, 1995) where the athlete took a banned substance without his knowledge. It would be an injustice not to reinstate an athlete in such circumstances.

However, if Dr. Wilkinson is found not to have told the truth, it is difficult to envision how such a finding could be out-weighed by any other circumstances which could be raised under the criteria in the Standard Operating Procedures. Indeed, to cheat and then to lie in an attempt to "cover up" her transgression would weigh negatively in relation to a number of those criteria.

Shortly after Dr. Wilkinson was informed that she had tested positive, Mr. Brantley prepared a letter to Mr. Wilson of Athletics Canada, dated July 21 and mailed on the same day. Since it is the crux of Ms. Wilkinson's case, it is reproduced in its entirety:

Dear Hugh,

I, Carl R. Brantley (Vladimir Koloff), am the husband of Dr. Karen D. Wilkinson-Brantley. She presently resides at 1017 Spike Rd., Hillsborough, NC 27278 and is a native of Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.

It has come to my attention that she has recently tested positive for the controlled (banned) substance, known scientifically as NANDRALONE also known as LAURABOLIN. It is also my understanding that my wife has never used any type of Anabolic Steroid, nor has she ever considered using them in her training.

Several weeks ago, I contacted you numerous time in regards to my wife's supposed use, this was a facade on my part to try and ruin my wife

athletic career, in retaliation for what I thought was an act of infidelity on her part. Subsequently, prior to June 7th, 1995, I added, put, administered, distributed into a "Subway" soft drink cup which my wife was drinking from, approximately 10 cc's of Laurabolin which I obtained in Mexico for just this purpose. In vindictive hope that it would show up on her next drug test and in turn she would be suspended from competition for several years.

I have in the last 6 weeks been seeking professional help for my problems (Medically and Psychiatrically) in hopes of leading a normal life again. My wife has never cheated on me or our marriage and has never ever taken any type DRUG that is illegal or is banned from consumption by Athletics Canada, JOC, USOC or the Center for Drug-Free Sport (Canada).

I am very sorry for the problems which I caused and hope that by me admitting to what I have done, (FREELEY) with know coercion, to my wife, that there will be no disciplinary measures taken against her in the future.

When he testified at the hearing, Mr. Brantley stated that the date of June 7th in the letter was a typographical error and the date should have been July 7th.

Dr. Wilkinson testified that after two weeks of multiple hourly phone calls following the June 7th separation, Mr. Brantley began to come to her office. This began approximately June 19th after he said he wanted to re-establish their relationship but she refused. He helped out with some of her office renovations but she later learned that he was also stopping at her home to "snoop" into some of her records and had taken some of her things. She last saw him on June 26th when she was treating a patient. He came into the office and caused a loud disturbance.

Mr. Brantley testified that on the same date, i.e. June 26th, he injected 10 ml. of Laurabolin into her drinking cup when she was in another room with a patient. He further testified that: it was a large cup, possibly 700 ml; it contained a soft drink, either Dr. Pepper

or Mello Yello; the cup contained ice but there was no straw or cover; he could not remember the colour of the soft drink. He also testified that he saw her finish the entire drink over a period of approximately one-half hour.

The basic issue in this case is one of credibility. Were Dr. Wilkinson and Mr. Brantley telling the truth when she claimed that she had never knowingly taken banned substances and when he claimed that he had sabotaged her drink?

**The Decision to Sabotage:**

Mr. Brantley's testimony was fraught with inconsistencies in relation to when he made the decision to "spike" his wife's drink, when he acquired the substance and when he finally gave up hopes of reconciling with her. These were fully explored in questioning by Ms. McTavish and Mr. Barber.

He claimed that he first saw her after the separation on June 17th when he wanted to have lunch with her and try to reconcile. However, on either the 17th or 18th, he had already received the substance in question. The simultaneous desire to reconcile with active steps towards sabotage are inconsistent.

In his testimony, he stated that someone else had obtained the drugs for him in Mexico. In his letter he had stated: "which I obtained in Mexico". This also indicates an inconsistency in his story.

Finally, he conceded that he had suggested to Mr. Wilson on June 12th that Dr. Wilkinson would test positive at the Nationals the following month. Yet, he had not yet decided on his sabotage plot. He spent the week-end of Friday, June 22nd, helping her at her office although he knew "it was all over". Yet the plot was not executed until June 26th, after he had found documentation that convinced him that she was having an affair. While

not conclusive, these inconsistencies do detract from the sabotage story.

**The June 7th Date:**

It is possible that the date of June 7th in Mr. Brantley's letter was a typographical error. However, Mr. Wilson specifically raised the date with Dr. Wilkinson prior to her application and nothing was done to correct it until Mr. Brantley took the stand. Moreover, the change occurred after Dr. Wilkinson was aware of Dr. Ayotte's expert opinion that positive results could not have occurred based on oral administration prior to June 7th with testing on July 7th.

It is possible that the original story was based on administration prior to the separation on June 7th but that the later date of June 26th was selected for the alleged sabotage and July 7th selected as the cut-off date in order to shorten the period of elimination from 30 to 11 days. In other words, this change could be an attempt to "get around" Dr. Ayotte's damning expert opinion based on administration of the drug prior to June 7th. However, this is merely a suspicious circumstance.

**The Taste:**

Dr. Wilkinson testified that she did not recall tasting anything unusual in her drinks on June 26th. She claimed that she always "gulped" her drinks - even tea and alcohol (which she rarely used). She also stated that she had a sinus problem which diminished her sense of smell.

Still, it clearly is not credible that Dr. Wilkinson would "gulp" 10 ml. of a sesame seed oil based substance from the top of a soda pop drink and not realize that she was drinking something other than soda pop. Mr. Barber, as counsel for the CCDS, arranged for demonstrative evidence as to how such a substance immediately rises to the top of a soda pop drink, even a few seconds after being shaken. Dr. Ayotte's expert testimony as to the

texture of the oil-base in which the drug in question is commonly found led to her conclusion that it would be impossible not to notice it. Common sense leads to the same conclusion. Dr. Wilkinson simply is not credible on this issue.

**Mr. Brantley's Steroid Use:**

Dr. Wilkinson testified that she took vitamins: B-Complex orally and B-12 by injection. She denied ever having taken any banned substance to her knowledge. However, she was vague and evasive when asked about Mr. Brantley's steroid use. She said that she was not aware of his knowledge of steroids. She had never seen his supply and did not want to know about his steroid use. She did acknowledge that he had used them in the past. However, she did not know if he injected them or took them orally. She thought he took them orally.

In contrast, Mr. Brantley admitted to extensive use of steroids and recited a long list of those which he had tried. He pointed out that Laurabolin is a preparation of nandralone and that it has never been put into tablet form. It is oil-based and injectable. He testified that he stopped taking steroids in December of 1994. This was approximately three months after he and Dr. Wilkinson began living together. He gave as his reason for stopping steroid use, a bad infection which he had received from a needle. He took the liberty, while testifying, of dropping his pants to show us the area of the infection on his upper thigh. He described it as having been many times the size of the area now indicated and being red and filled with pus. He pointed out that, particularly, as a wrestler, he could not afford to have such an ugly sore on his body. He also implied that the physical risk of such an infection was not worth the benefits.

It is difficult to appreciate that Dr. Wilkinson would have so little awareness of Mr. Brantley's steroid use when they were living together. However, it is even more difficult to believe that she would not have noticed the wound and learned that it was caused by a

needle. Her testimony that she thought that Mr. Brantley's steroid use was oral rather than by injection also detracts from her credibility.

**The Conflicting Stories:**

Essentially, Mr. Brantley has advanced two conflicting stories. The first is the story which was told to Mr. Wilson by telephone: Dr. Wilkinson had been taking steroids for a 12 year period; She avoided detection at the Harry Jerome Classic by cheating; If she is tested at the Canadian Nationals in mid-July, she will test positive. The second story is that she has never taken drugs except for the time when he spiked her drink on June 26th and that is the reason why she tested positive on July 7th.

The difficulty with the second version is that he decided to take this course only after he had confidently asserted in his first story the allegation that she would test positive if tested. Moreover, he did not know on June 26th that she would be tested on July 7th so that the alleged sabotage must have been directed at the Canadian Nationals. Finally, he was aware that Laurabolin was not effective when taken orally. Did he believe that an oral dosage on June 26th would result in a positive test at the Canadian Nationals in mid-July? These circumstances support the truth of his earlier allegations and contradict his second story.

**Carolina Winter Madness:**

Mr. Wilson's notes of his conversation with Mr. Brantley on June 13th, include the following:

He indicated that Karen Wilkinson had falsified her performance documents to qualify for the Pan American Championships and that her coach was not aware of it. He said he had called the coach's wife and told her just that.

This incident is the subject of a separate inquiry and is not directly relevant to Dr. Wilkinson's positive drug test. However, if she acted dishonestly in relation to qualifying for that event, that is a factor which logically can be taken into account in assessing her credibility when she asserts that she had never intentionally used banned substances.

In order to be selected to compete for Canada at the Pan American Games, Dr. Wilkinson was required to "throw standard". This meant that she would have to throw the javelin in excess of the 56 metre qualifying distance set out in the selection criteria established by Athletics Canada for that competition. Dr. Wilkinson stated that her previous best throw had been 54.68 metres. In late January, she forwarded to Athletics Canada the results of an alleged competition which indicate that she had thrown 56.26 metres. These results are dated January 29, 1995 and the apparent signature of Jeff Gorski is at the bottom of the page. Jeff Gorski was Dr. Wilkinson's coach.

In a letter to the British Columbia Athletics Disciplinary Committee, Dr. Wilkinson explained that she had informed her coach of "the need to put on a mini-meet so that I would have a chance to attain the Pan Am standard". She claimed that her coach had organized the "meet" and that she had participated only as an athlete. She claimed that her coach had also suggested that her husband officiate since "it can be difficult to round up officials". She stated that her coach had offered to convert one of their practices into a meet.

Dr. Wilkinson stated that the other competitors were Lynda Lipson, a member of the U.S. javelin team who also trained under Jeff Gorski and his 8-year-old daughter, Michelle Gorski, who used a smaller training javelin. She said that they "came up" with the name "Carolina Winter Madness" for the meet. She seemed to have no problem in characterizing such a converted practice as a legitimate competition for qualifying purposes even though there was only one other competitor (apart from the coach's 8-year-old daughter), there

were no other events and the "official" who measured her results was her husband. She stated that the legitimacy of the competition was the responsibility of her coach and out of her control.

In her letter, Dr. Wilkinson stated that her coach "suggested I type the results up" with a view to him signing them later. At the hearing, she testified that she had initiated the suggestion by asking: "Can I type up the results and you sign them later?" to which he agreed. In both versions, she claimed that when she later called him by telephone, he was busy and told her to sign the results for him and send them off, which she did. This is a further inconsistency which detracts from Dr. Wilkinson's credibility as a witness.

Mr. Brantley retracted this allegation of falsified results when testifying at the hearing, just as he retracted his other allegations in relation to Dr. Wilkinson's drug use. He attempted to support her version of the "meet" but was contradictory in two significant respects. He was emphatic in testifying that the coach had told her to sign and send the results immediately after the throwing was completed and as he was rushing off. Dr. Wilkinson claimed that she received this instruction only later, after the results were typed and she spoke with Mr. Gorski by telephone. Secondly, he testified that she had organized the meet together with her coach. However, she emphatically denied any role in organizing the meet. Their stories simply do not hold together.

On June 14th (the day after Mr. Brantley's call resulting in Mr. Wilson's note of this allegation which is quoted above), Mr. Wilson called Dr. Wilkinson's coach, Jeff Gorski. Mr. Gorski immediately sent a letter to Mr. Wilson stating that Dr. Wilkinson:

... forged my signature on the results sent to you. I assure you that no such competition ever took place.

Mr. Gorski subsequently provided further documentation to the B.C. Athletics Disciplinary

Committee to the same effect.

Dr. Wilkinson took the position that Mr. Gorski did not support her position in this matter because he was intimidated and threatened by Mr. Brantley. Presumably, her logic is based on the fact that when first contacted, Mr. Gorski was supporting Mr. Brantley's allegation. However, Mr. Gorski denied being intimidated or threatened by Mr. Brantley. Mr. Brantley also denied attempting to intimidate or threaten Mr. Gorski. Moreover, even when Mr. Brantley's position changed, Mr. Gorski remained steadfast. His complete co-operation in relation to this adjudication as well as the B.C. disciplinary proceedings is completely contrary to Dr. Wilkinson's theory.

In sum, Dr. Wilkinson has been hopelessly caught in a deception. She attempted to defend what would have been a "sham" competition. She falsified results which permitted her to compete in the Pan Am Games. Finally, she continued to deny any wrongdoing under oath at the hearing in relation to this adjudication. The evidence by her and Mr. Brantley in relation to the alleged sabotage of her drink was not credible. Their evidence in relation to the non-existent "Carolina Winter Madness" meet detracts even further from their credibility on that issue.

#### **The Drug Test:**

However, even if Mr. Brantley's testimony about the spiking of the drink were true, it would not provide an explanation for the positive drug test on July 7th. Dr. Christiane Ayotte is Chief of the Doping Control Laboratory of the Institut national de la recherche scientifique in Montreal. This is one of three laboratories in North America which have satisfied the stringent accreditation standards of the International Olympic Committee. It is a basic component of Canada's drug policy for athletes that their drug testing be done at this laboratory.

Dr. Ayotte testified that Dr. Wilkinson's test showed a significant concentration of metabolites of nandralone in her urine. The concentration was 40 and 19 nanograms per millilitre of urine for the two glucuroides which were measured. This was in spite of the urine being somewhat diluted. To be testable, urine must have a specific gravity of 1.010 or greater. Dr. Wilkinson's sample was 1.011. Dr. Ayotte testified that, in the past, athletes have been known to drink excessive liquids prior to testing as an attempt to dilute their urine and thereby reduce the concentration which might be present.

Dr. Ayotte explained that nandralone is not active when taken orally. It is, therefore, made soluble in sesame oil and must be injected if it is to be effective. If it is injected, it can remain in the system for several months, since the slowest phase of distribution through the body's system and, ultimately, elimination, is at the injection site. This process of distribution from the site of injection to the blood involves a mean half-life of approximately 7-8 days. However, once the substance is in the blood leading to excretion, the half-life is from 30 minutes to 4 hours. When taken orally, the first phase of distribution is by-passed. As a result, concentration will rise and peak in the blood after 2-3 hours and in the urine after 24 hours. The concentration in the urine would then decline over the next 2-3 days and after that time only traces would remain. A trace is a concentration of from .1 to 1 ml. and is not classified as a positive test. Dr. Wilkinson's sample showed 40 and 19 nanograms per ml. (in spite of the low specific gravity or dilution of the sample). Dr. Ayotte provided scientific literature in support of her testimony.

She testified that if 10 ml. of Laurabolin (a veterinary preparation of nandralone) were taken orally on June 26th and a sample were taken on July 7th, at most, the sample would contain traces. In her view, the absolute outside limit for a positive test would be seven days.

Dr. Wilkinson filed letters from Dr. Siu C. Chan of the Foothills Hospital in Calgary. Dr. Chan is also an expert on anabolic steroids. Dr. Chan stated that there is no scientific

literature on how long nandralone metabolites could be detected in the urine after oral administration. Dr. Chan agreed with Dr. Ayotte that the metabolites would remain detectable only for a few days. However, that conclusion would only apply to a therapeutic dose.

Dr. Chan considered a dose of 10 ml. of Laurabolin to be a supra-physiological dose. Dr. Chan stated that:

... it is only logical to assume that the metabolites will excrete in the urine for a longer period of time but how much longer is an unanswered question.

However, Dr. Ayotte did answer this question. She had reached her conclusion through her convincing analysis of the body's elimination process.

She pointed out that even if a massive dose were taken, the time frame for elimination would be only marginally extended. The concentration would peak at a higher level and higher levels would continue throughout the downward curve of elimination but the time line from ingestion to elimination would be affected only slightly. In her words:

If this substance is taken orally (single dose), it will be inactivated very fast by the liver and excreted within a few days. Traces will be detected after four to five days.

In other words, the positive test of the sample provided by Dr. Wilkinson on July 7th cannot be explained by the alleged spiking of her drink on June 26th. I do not believe her testimony that she had never knowingly taken a banned substance.

**Postscript:**

In a final, bizarre twist to this case, Mr. Brantley contacted the counsel to this adjudication, Mr. Tom Barber, by telephone on the eve of the resumption of the hearing for final arguments on August 23rd. Mr. Brantley also telephoned me but I declined to discuss the case with him and he accepted that position. However Mr. Barber, quite properly, did hear what Mr. Brantley had to say, kept careful notes and promptly advised all of the parties, making his notes available to them.

In his conversation with Mr. Barber, Mr. Brantley referred to his testimony as "a lie". When Mr. Barber asked what was a lie, he answered that he had lied about everything. He stated that: "I never put anything in her drink" and that: "Dr. Ayotte proved it was bullshit". He confirmed that Dr. Wilkinson used nandralone by injection as well as other drugs. He stated that she had not used any drugs since Argentina. He stated that he was together with Dr. Wilkinson from Thursday until Sunday, when they were in Ottawa for the hearing and that he drove her to the airport when she left. He stated that prior to calling Mr. Barber, he had obtained copies of some telephone records which convinced him that she still was having an affair with the shot putter in question.

**Mr. Brantley's Credibility:**

Mr. Brantley's credibility is crucial to Dr. Wilkinson's application since it is the foundation for her explanation for testing positive. In attempting to put the best possible light on a weak case, her counsel, Mr. Dehler, argued that Mr. Brantley's testimony at the hearing should be accepted. He pointed out that unlike his earlier and later allegations, his testimony was given under oath and subjected to critical questioning. Another, but simplistic, approach would be to conclude that neither his testimony nor his earlier allegations (and subsequent recanting of his testimony) should be believed because of their inconsistency and because of his erratic emotional state. However, even if everything is ignored except his testimony, that testimony is not credible.

Mr. Brantley's behaviour has been compulsive, erratic, inconsistent and violent over

the past two months. However, there appears to be one constant. When his jealousy was aroused by another suspicion that Dr. Wilkinson was continuing a suspected affair, he attempted to punish her by telling the truth. At other times, perhaps with the hope of a possible reconciliation, he was prepared to lie for her. He testified that he still loved his wife and he kissed her when leaving the hearing room.

**Other Matters:**

Dr. Wilkinson testified that Mr. Brantley had threatened a number of times after June 7th to "get even" with her. He threatened to get his "pound of flesh" by ending her athletic career. Such threats were supported by evidence of Dr. Wilkinson's clients and neighbours. These were advanced both as the motive for the sabotage and as evidence in support of it.

While such threats would provide a motive, they beg the question as to whether or not Dr. Wilkinson was a deliberate steroid user. In other words, they are consistent with sabotage. However, they are also consistent with her prior drug use. His threats to "get even" and to end her athletic career could have been no more than threats to tell the truth about her steroid use.

Reference was also made during the hearing to a change in Dr. Wilkinson's voice. Another reference was made to an alleged change in her physique which caused her coach to raise the issue of steroids with her. However, these were rather vague and were not pursued in fairness to Dr. Wilkinson.

**Conclusion:**

I would like to thank all of the parties and counsel for their assistance. However, in particular, Mr. Barber made heroic efforts to ensure that this adjudication could be completed in time for Dr. Wilkinson to compete in Japan if her application for reinstatement was approved. Her application was received on July 28th. The preliminary meeting was

held on August 9th. The hearing commenced on August 18th and was concluded on August 23rd. Everything possible was done to deal with logistical, disclosure and evidentiary matters with impeccable fairness and objectivity as well as efficiency.

It is unfortunate that the outcome could not be more favourable to the applicant. However, Dr. Wilkinson's application for Category II Reinstatement has been denied.

Dated at Ottawa, this 6th day of September, 1995.

---

Ed Ratushny, Adjudicator

